



DPW

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	10/803856-Conf. #6542
	Filing Date	March 18, 2004
	First Named Inventor	Jeffrey S. Poulin
	Art Unit	3639
	Examiner Name	J. M. Bass
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	Attorney Docket Number	L0562.70049US00

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Interview Summary Return Receipt Postcard
<div>Remarks</div>		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm Name	WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.		
Signature			
Printed name	Randy J. Pritzker		
Date	October 7, 2005	Reg. No.	35,986

DPW

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.	
Dated: 10/11/05	Signature: (Elyse B. Pino)



Docket No.: L0562.70049US00
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Jeffrey S. Poulin
Serial No.: 10/803856
Confirmation No.: 6542
Filed: March 18, 2004
For: METHODS AND APPARATUS FOR PROCESSING BUSINESS
REPLY MAIL
Examiner: J. M. Bass
Art Unit: 3639

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Dated: 10/11/05

Elyse B. Pino
Elyse B. Pino

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

MS Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant thanks Examiner Bass and Examiner Hayes for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview of September 1, 2005. The substance of the telephone interview is summarized herein.

During the telephone interview, Applicant inquired as to whether the amendment to claim 1 made in the response mailed August 22, 2005 would overcome the §101 rejection. Examiner Hayes indicated that if the limitation of claim 1 reciting use of a sorting apparatus were moved from the preamble to the body of the claim, the §101 rejection would be overcome.

The rejection of claims 1-10 and 21-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as purportedly being unpatentable over Connelly (6,459,953) was also discussed. Applicant pointed out that the processing system disclosed by Connelly is capable of processing only business reply mail pieces and not other types of mail pieces. Therefore, Applicant indicated that the system of Connelly does

not receive a stream of mail pieces that includes at least one not business reply mail piece. Examiner Hayes indicated that he believed that the system of Connelly is capable of processing non-business reply mail pieces because Connelly discloses at column 3, lines 21-24 that business reply cards, postcards, and the like are loaded by an operator into the processing system 100 at the input feeder module 102. Examiner Hayes further pointed out that at column 3, lines 39-41, Connelly discloses that the ability to handle mixed mail is highly desirable. In response, Applicant indicated that the cited passages do not disclose a system that handles non-business reply mail pieces as the postcards referred to at column 3, lines 21-24 are business reply mail pieces and the mixed mail referred to at column 3, line 41 simply refers to business reply mail pieces from different mail campaigns. No agreement with respect to the §102 rejection under Connelly was reached.

The rejection of claims 11-16 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as purportedly being obvious over Sansone (6,108,643) in view of Connelly was also discussed. Applicant pointed out that Sansone is unrelated to the processing of business reply mail pieces and it was unclear why the Sansone reference was being applied. Examiner Hayes indicated that the rejection of claims 11-16 and 17-20 under the combination of Sansone and Connelly would be withdrawn and a new non-final Office Action would be issued.

Dated: October 7, 2005

ii
RJP

Respectfully submitted,

By Randy J. Pritzker
Randy J. Pritzker
Registration No.: 35,986
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000